UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,048	04/08/2004	Robert L. Faulk JR.	200313930-1	2246

22879   7590   10/17/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HALIYUR, VENKATESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2419	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/822,048	FAULK, ROBERT L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VENKATESH HALIYUR	2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 June 2008_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) _18-25_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-17_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed on 06/18/2008 has been considered for claims 1-25 but is

ineffective to overcome Droms et al, Donaldson and Fan et al references for claims 1-

17. Rejection follows.

2.   Claims 1- 25 is pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Droms et al [US Pat: 7,143,435] in view of Donaldson [US Pat: 7,249,175].

        Regarding claim 1, Droms et al in the invention of "Method and Apparatus for

Registering Auto-Configured Network Addresses Based on Connection Authentication"

disclosed a method of developing an access control list, comprising: developing an

enhanced access control list **(item 146 of Fig 1)** including data related to at least one of user names **(user groups),** DNS names **(URL),** Windows domain names **(domain names)**, and physical addresses **(col 8, lines 30-62)**; DNS names into corresponding IP addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list **(col 9, lines 1-27, col 12, lines 50-67, col 13, lines 1-24);** and physical addresses **(MAC address)** into IP addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list **(col 10, lines 16-32, col 12, lines 21-32);** and developing the access control list from each of the operations of converting **(col 9, lines 14-27,** but fails to disclose converting at least one of user names into corresponding IP address. However, Donaldson in the invention of "Method and System for Blocking E-Mail having a Nonexistent Sender Address" disclosed a method for converting user names into corresponding IP addresses **(convert physical interface to logical interface, col 13, lines 25-49).**

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention of made to include the method of converting user names into corresponding IP address as taught by Donaldson in the system of Droms et al to covert user names and physical addresses into IP addresses. One is motivated as such in order to determine an IP address with minimum latency to route an information packet based on user name and physical address.

Regarding claim 2, Droms et al disclosed storing the user names and corresponding IP addresses in a mapping state database that defines current relationships among user names **(col 7, lines 24-35),** DNS names, domain names **(col 12, lines 21-32),** and physical addresses **(col 11, lines 20-28, col 16, lines 1-19).**

Regarding claims 3, 11, Droms et al disclosed that each physical address comprises a MAC address **(col 10, lines 16-23, col 16, lines 1-19)**.

Regarding claims 4, 13, Droms et al disclosed that converting user names into corresponding IP and physical addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list comprises: detecting login packets **(authentication, user ID and password)** being communicated over the network; determining a MAC address from the login packets **(col 2, lines 17-25)**; detecting server message block login packets being communicated over the network **(col 2, lines 25-37)**; and determining an IP address from the server message block login packets; and developing records in the access control list using the obtained IP address for the respective user name **(col 2, lines 38-52, col 8, lines 30-62)**.

Regarding claims 5-6,13-14, Droms et al disclosed converting DNS names into corresponding IP addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list comprises: detecting packets having an unknown source IP address **(col 9, lines 14-24)**; generating a DNS name query using the source IP address **(col 9, lines 24-27)**; receiving a DNS name associated with the IP address responsive to the query; and developing records in the access control list using the obtained IP address for the respective DNS name **(col 8, lines 30-62)** and occasionally generating new DNS name queries for the source IP address and thereafter repeating the operations of receiving and developing to update the access control list **(col 12, lines 21-33)**..

Regarding claims 7, 15, Droms et al disclosed occasionally receiving the DNS name associated with the IP address and thereafter repeating the operation of developing to update the access control list **(col 12, lines 66-67, col 13, lines 1-9).**

Regarding claims 8,17, Droms et al disclosed converting physical addresses into IP addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list comprises: monitoring DHCP packets communicated over the network **(col 13, lines 10-15)**; obtaining an IP address assigned to a particular physical address from the monitored DHCP packets **(col 11, lines 20-24)**; and developing records in the access control list using the obtained IP address assigned to a respective physical address **(col 11, lines 25-36)**.

Regarding claims 9-10, Droms et al disclosed a method of controlling access of a user to a network including a plurality of hosts coupled together through a network switch **(item 102 of Fig 1)**, the method comprising: storing in the network switch an enhanced access control list containing data related to at least one of user names **(user groups, col 7, lines 24-35)**, DNS names **(URL)**, Windows domain names **(domain names)**, and physical addresses **(col 9, lines 14-17, col 11, lines 20-28, col 12, lines 28-31, lines 50-67, col 13, lines 1-24);** and generating a dynamic access control list from the enhanced access control list, the dynamic access control list containing a plurality of IP addresses that restrict access of the user to the network **(col 16, lines 21-32)** and mapping user names to physical addresses; mapping physical addresses to IP addresses **(col 10, lines 16-32)**; mapping unknown IP addresses to physical addresses; and mapping unknown IP addresses to DNS names **(col 8, lines 30-62)**;

and applying rules set forth in the enhanced access control list relating to controlling
access of a user to the addresses determined by the operations of mapping to generate
the access control list **(col 9, lines 9-27),** but fails to disclose mapping user names to IP
addresses.

However, Donaldson disclosed a method for converting user names into
corresponding IP addresses **(Fig 8, col 13, lines 17-33).**

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the
time the invention of made to include the method of converting user names into
corresponding IP address as taught by Donaldson in the system of Droms et al to covert
user names and physical addresses into IP addresses. One is motivated as such in
order to determine an IP address with minimum latency to route an information packet
based on user name and physical address.

Regarding claims 12, 16, Droms et al disclosed that the mapping user names to
IP addresses comprises: detecting server message block login packets being
communicated over the network **(col 12, lines 50-67)**; and determining an IP address
from the server message block login packets and mapping unknown IP addresses to
physical addresses comprises detecting packets having an unknown source IP address
(col 13, lines 1-18).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's argument, see remarks, filed on 06/18/2008, with respect to rejection

of claims 1-17 have been fully considered and is not persuasive for claims 1-17.

        With respect to applicant's argument for claims 1, 9 dependent claims, that

Droms does not teach or suggest storing in the network switch enhanced access control

list including data related to at least one of user names, DNS names, Windows domain

names, and physical addresses. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees and

points applicants to the reference, where Droms disclosed a method where gateway

(item 145 of Fig 1) which stores and maintains the access control list checks the source

IP address in the message sent by the host via the network switch (item 102 of Fig 1)

and further disclosed a method for checking the message for user names (user

identification) and URL (domain names) by the DNS to process the request from host

(col 12, lines 50-67, col 13, lines 1-24, Figs 1-2).

        With respect to applicant's argument for independent claims 1, 9 and dependent

claims, that Droms does not teach or suggest a method of developing an access control

list, however, the examiner respectfully disagrees and points applicants to reference,

where Droms disclosed a method for maintaining the access list and further disclosed

adding IP addresses to the list for controlling the access (col 13, lines 1-24) to process

the requests from hosts.

        With respect to applicant's argument for independent claims 1, 9 and dependent

claims, that Droms does not teach or suggest converting user names into corresponding

IP and physical addresses according to data in the enhanced access control list.

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees and points applicants to reference, where

Droms disclosed mapping (converting) physical address (MAC) and logical addresses

(IP) for identifying the source and destination address of the request and response

messages that is processed by the gateway (col 15, lines 60-67, col 16, lines 1-61). It is

also well known in the art that such mapping of physical to logical address (or vice-

versa) to convert physical to logical address in access lists to route the response

messages during authentication and authorization process.

    With respect to applicant's argument for independent claims 1, 9 and dependent

claims that Donaldson does not teach or suggest converting user names into

corresponding IP and physical addresses according to data in the enhanced access

control list. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees and points applicants to

reference, where Donaldson discloses a method of mapping physical LAN interface

(physical address) to logical interfaces (IP address) and physical to logical address (or

vice-versa) mapping by the router (col 13, lines 18-49). Also Donaldson further

disclosed a method for dynamically updating and storing the IP addresses in access list

for performing access verification during the address lookup process (col 9, lines 4-18,

co 19, lines 37-54).

    With respect to applicant's arguments for claims 18-25, the examiner agrees with

the applicant's argument that the claims 18-25 are allowable as prior art fails to teach

the claim limitation where forwarding circuit is operable to process the specific packets

stored in the memory circuit using the enhanced access control list to generate the

dynamic access control list and store the dynamic access control list in the memory

circuit, and therefore the allowability for claims 18-25 is indicated in this office action

below.

Allowable Subject Matter

7.   a) Claims 18-25 are allowed over prior art.

The prior art fails to teach and render obvious the limitations for a network

switching circuit as claimed in claims 18 and 22:

"provide the specific packets on a processor port, and further operable to

receive packets on one of a plurality of ports including the processor port and to

forward each received packet to a port corresponding to a destination address

contained in the packet subject to access restrictions contained in a dynamic

access control list; a memory circuit coupled to the forwarding circuit, the

memory circuit operable to store packets and operable to store an enhanced

access control list and a dynamic access control list;"

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be

directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached @ (571)-272-7884. Any inquiry of a general

nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the

group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

10.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

/Venkatesh Haliyur/

Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Edan Orgad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419